Appl. No. 10/616,091
Response Dated January 23, 2009
Reply to Office Action of September 25, 2008

Docket No.: 1070.P3821
Examiner: Zhou, Ting
TC/A.U. 2173

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1-7, 9-17, 19, 20 and 22-41 stand in this application. Claims 1, 6, 11, 16,

22, 27, 32 and 37 are currently amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the

current amendments can be found at least at Applicant's specification page 17, lines 7-8,

page 21, lines 1-9, page 28, lines 6-9, and page 39, lines 15-21. Favorable

reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103

At page 2, paragraph 4 claims 1-7, 9-17, 19-20 and 22-41 stand rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dyszel (Handspring Visor for Dummies) in

view of Microsoft Windows Version 5.1 (hereinafter "Windows"). Applicant

respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the

obviousness rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, taken alone or in

combination, fail to teach or suggest every element recited in claims 1-7, 9-17, 19-20 and

22-41. Therefore claims 1-7, 9-17, 19-20 and 22-41 define over the cited references

whether taken alone or in combination.

Claims 1-5, 11-15, 22-26 and 32-36 define over the cited references whether

taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 1 recites the following language, in

relevant part:

Appl. No. 10/616,091
Response Dated January 23, 2009
Reply to Office Action of September 25, 2008

Docket No.: 1070.P3821
Examiner: Zhou, Ting
TC/A.U. 2173

> displaying a first weekly view graphical image on an
> effective display area of a display screen, said display
> screen including a collapsible active input area arranged to
> accept alpha-numeric inputs….

Applicant respectfully submits that he has been unable to locate at least the above recited language of independent claim 1 in the teachings of Dyszel or Windows. For example, the Office Action alleges that Dyszel discloses an "active input area" as the area displaying the "Done" and "Details" buttons shown in Figure 1-3. However, the area displaying the "Done" and "Details" buttons shown in Figure 1-3 is not collapsible. Further, this area is not "arranged to accept alpha-numeric inputs" as recited in claim 1. In another example, the Office Action alleges that Windows discloses an "active input area" that is collapsible as the selectable tool bars shown in Screenshot 9. However, the selectable tool bars are also not "arranged to accept alpha-numeric inputs" as recited in claim 1. Therefore, both Dyszel and Windows fail to disclose at least "a collapsible active input area arranged to accept alpha-numeric inputs" as recited in claim 1. Consequently, the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest every element recited in claim 1. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claim 1.

Furthermore, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious. *See* MPEP § 2143.03, for example. Therefore, claims 2-5 also are non-obvious and patentable over the cited references, taken alone or in combination, at least on the basis of their dependency from claim 1. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to these dependent claims.

Appl. No. 10/616,091
Response Dated January 23, 2009
Reply to Office Action of September 25, 2008

Docket No.: 1070.P3821
Examiner: Zhou, Ting
TC/A.U. 2173

Claims 11, 22 and 32 have been amended to recite features similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11, 22 and 32 are not obvious and are patentable over the cited references for reasons analogous to those presented with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the obviousness rejections with respect to claims 11, 22 and 32. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejections with respect to claims 12-15, 23-26 and 33-36 that depend from claims 11, 22 or 32, and therefore contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from the cited references.

Claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 16, 17, 19-21, 27-31 and 37-41 also define over the cited references whether taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 6 recites the following language, in relevant part:

> displaying a weekly view graphical image on a display screen, said display screen is switchable between a small display mode which is substantially square in shape and a tall display mode which is substantially rectangular in shape using a sliding mechanism, wherein said weekly view graphical image comprises days of the week and appointment icons therein....

Applicant respectfully submits that he has been unable to locate at least the above recited language of independent claim 6 in the teachings of Dyszel or Windows. For instance, neither Dyszel nor Windows discloses any mechanism to switch a display screen from square to rectangular shape, let alone a sliding mechanism. Therefore, both Dyszel and Windows fail to disclose at least "said display screen is switchable between a small display mode which is substantially square in shape and a tall display mode which is substantially rectangular in shape using a sliding mechanism" as recited in claim 6.

Appl. No. 10/616,091
Response Dated January 23, 2009
Reply to Office Action of September 25, 2008

Docket No.: 1070.P3821
Examiner: Zhou, Ting
TC/A.U. 2173

Consequently, the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest every element recited in claim 6. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claim 6.

Furthermore, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious. *See* MPEP § 2143.03, for example. Therefore, claims 7, 9 and 10 also are non-obvious and patentable over the cited references, taken alone or in combination, at least on the basis of their dependency from claim 6. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to these dependent claims.

Independent claims 16 and 27 have been amended to recite features similar to those recited in claim 1. Claim 37 recites a folding mechanism rather than a sliding mechanism, which is similarly not shown by Dyszel or Windows. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 16, 27 and 37 are not obvious and are patentable over the cited references for reasons analogous to those presented with respect to claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the obviousness rejections with respect to claims 16, 27 and 37. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejections with respect to claims 17, 19-21, 28-31 and 38-41 that depend from claims 16, 27 or 37, and therefore contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from the cited references.

Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-7, 9-17, 19, 20 and 22-41 recite novel features not shown by the cited references. Further, Applicant submits

Appl. No. 10/616,091
Response Dated January 23, 2009
Reply to Office Action of September 25, 2008

Docket No.: 1070.P3821
Examiner: Zhou, Ting
TC/A.U. 2173

that the above-recited novel features provide new and unexpected results not recognized

by the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are not

anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the cited references.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office

Action's rejection with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be

necessary to further distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references, taken

alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the dependent claims

that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to

be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims

pointed out above.

It is believed that claims 1-7, 9-17, 19, 20 and 22-41 are in allowable form.

Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if

such contact would further the examination of the present patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

/John F. Kacvinsky/

John F. Kacvinsky, Reg. No. 40,040
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: January 23, 2009

Kacvinsky LLC
C/O Intellevate
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402